

REMARKS

The Office Action of October 30, 2007 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection and objection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-19, 22-25, 27-42 and 44-46 remain in the application. Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 27, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 42, 45 and 46 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification as filed. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

In independent claims 1 and 24, the phrase “at least one bleed-controlling polymer consisting of” has been deleted before the term “hydrolyzed styrene-maleic anhydride copolymer”. Several other amendments to make the claim language more clear and consistent have also been made.

Claims 1-2, 4-19, 22-25, 27-42 and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The examiner has alleged that there is no guidance in the specification to exclude in the claims the use of bleed-control polymers other than hydrolyzed styrene-maleic anhydride copolymers and to exclude the use of a dispersible black pigment in the pigment-based black ink.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this allegation. Although the specification discusses the use of bleed-control polymers in general, the detailed description specifically discusses the use of styrene maleic anhydride as a bleed control polymer in the examples. Furthermore, Sartomer's SMA-1000H, a hydrolyzed form of styrene maleic anhydride, is the polymer in the embodiments given in examples 1 and 2, which constitute all of the examples. These examples clearly provide support in the specification for claiming styrene maleic anhydride as the only bleed control polymer.

As for self-dispersed or dispersible black pigments, the specification lists both kinds of these pigments that can be used in the black ink of the present application. In paragraph [0034] of the specification, it states that: “The black ink compositions employed herein comprise the self-dispersed pigment, the polymer (styrene-maleic anhydride copolymer), and the ink vehicle.” Paragraph [0034] then goes on to say that the embodiments in the specification are not limited to those containing self-dispersed pigment. Therefore, the

specification infers that self-dispersed pigments are the preferred embodiment pigments. Furthermore, self-dispersed pigments are the pigments in the embodiments given in examples 1 and 2. As with styrene maleic anhydride, these examples clearly provide support in the specification for self-dispersed pigment as the only pigment.

For this reason, the applicants assert that sufficient guidance is given in the specification to support the limitations excluding all bleed control polymers except hydrolyzed styrene maleic anhydride and excluding all black pigments except self-dispersed pigments.

With these arguments and support from the specification, the examiner's concerns expressed in the §112 rejection should be obviated.

As such, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as defined in independent claims 1 and 24, and in those claims depending ultimately therefrom, is allowable.

In summary, claims 1-2, 4-19, 22-25, 27-42 and 44-46 remain in the application. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicants' invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/Julia Church Dierker/

Julia Church Dierker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33368
(248) 649-9900, ext. 25
juliad@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109
Troy, Michigan 48084-2813
Dated: January 30, 2008
JCD/WBH